

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

NOBLE PARTY a/k/a THERON
PRESTON WASHINGTON,

Case No. 21-CV-2219 (PJS/ECW)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

SCOTUSblog and UNITED STATES
SUPREME COURT,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, *pro se*.

This action comes before the Court on Plaintiff Noble Party's (1) Complaint, ECF No. 1, and (2) Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, ECF No. 2. As Party seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), the action is subject to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), under which a court "shall" dismiss an IFP action "at any time" if the court determines that (among other things) the action is "frivolous or malicious." Upon review, the Court concludes that (among other problems) the proposed civil action lacks an arguable basis either in fact or in law and therefore is frivolous.¹ See

¹ As the Court understands it, Party argues that the U.S. Supreme Court may lack independence because a purportedly common acronym for the Court—namely, "SCOTUS"—is "translucent" and somehow links the Court to Scottish courts. See Compl. at 3–5. These propositions are absurd.

Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Accordingly, the Court dismisses this action (though without prejudice to the filing of a paid complaint making the same allegations). *See, e.g., Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 34 (1992); *Wilson v. Johnston*, 68 F. App'x 761, 761–762 (8th Cir. 2003) (citing *Denton*). The Court also denies the IFP Application as moot. Finally, the Court also certifies that any appeal taken from this Order would not be in good faith, and thus any request to proceed IFP on appeal will be denied on that basis. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3)(A).

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: October 13, 2021

s/Patrick J. Schiltz

Patrick J. Schiltz

United States District Judge